



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pendence and the nobleness of honest citizenship, feel with Cornelia of ancient Rome that the most precious jewels she can show are her patriotic children?

SAMUEL W. MENDUM.

THE BRUTAL SEX.

WHEN Mrs. Poyser, in the course of one of her memorable arguments with Mr. Craig on "the woman question," wound up by admitting that, though women might be foolish, "God Almighty made 'em to match the men," she supplied a statement of the seemingly unanswerable variety which her sex have not been slow to make use of in discussions regarding the respective merits or failings of the sexes. As *Malvolio*, however, when questioned concerning Pythagoras's assertion that the soul of our grandam might haply inhabit a bird, replied that he thought nobly of the soul and in no way approved of the opinion, so I must declare that I think too nobly of woman to approve altogether of Mrs. Poyser's theory and assent to its proposition that women were made to match the men. If it were true, then the human race were in a most parlous state. If it were true, then the masculine would not be *the brutal sex*.

To be cruel is not necessarily to be brutal, in the ordinary acceptation of those terms, however lexicographers may decide the matter for themselves. A person may be both brutal and cruel, or only cruel, or, again, only brutal. In ordinary speech we distinguish between the two words by applying the term "cruel" to merciless acts which seem to imply a definite amount of deliberate thought preparatory to their execution, and "brutal" to similar acts committed without such thought and on the impulse of the moment. So it is that we speak of "refined cruelty," but not of "refined brutality." I have elsewhere intimated that women are often cruel; I should be sorry to believe that they could be brutal.

Cruelty is a defensive attribute of weakness; brutality the vice of strength. The exhibition of these two traits manifests itself early in our human nature. Let any one observe groups of boys and girls at their separate games, and he will see among the former the brute nature asserting its presence with more or less vehemence, according to circumstances, in a free interchange of kicks and blows, while among the girls he will observe actions that are cruel rather than brutal, and which involve mental rather than physical distress. But it is the brutal rather than the cruel side that comes into boldest relief. And among men and women the same degree of difference exists. The stronger sex is still the brutal one.

With brutality is often blended a vein of reckless generosity, a doubtful virtue, the exercise of which often serves to moderate or even dissipate in the public mind the effect of the brutality. But this is somewhat aside from the main theme. It is not needful to go back to the past to sustain the assertion that the masculine sex, taken in its entirety, is a brutal one. We can find proofs enough of it close at hand in our own time. Nor need we take exaggerated instances of it, such as now and then shock us in White-chapel atrocities or the acts of Stanley's rear-guard in darkest Africa, or in the practices of semi-barbarous peoples. We have but to look at existing states of things in the most enlightened nations of the globe.

Among the rougher elements that form part of the social structure, we find most inhuman practices to be of common occurrence. Men think little of beating their beasts of burden most savagely, and nearly as often and as

savagely, their unfortunate wives. The impulse to either act is in no way restrained by reason, and is simply the result of an outbreak of brute nature.

If the brutality of modern life touched no greater extremes than these and was confined to the lower strata of society, we might look for its elimination in time, for the progress of intelligence would supplement the workings of law. But brutality is deep-rooted in man's nature; its motives are not the accidents of the moment in their source when its most baleful consequences are concerned, but are among the fundamental passions of man.

Think for a moment what is implied in the single fact that in no part of the world is it deemed safe for a woman to go alone after dark, nor, in many localities, by day even. It is not enough to reply that woman must have a trustworthy masculine escort because she is timid. Why should she be timid? Under similar circumstances a man may fear the personal violence of an enemy or the loss of his money and valuables. A woman has to dread man's "wildness and the chances of the dark." In plain words, she fears that, if unattended, some man will seek to rob her of her honor. And is not this fear of hers an arraignment of civilization itself? How much better does civilized man show above his savage brother in relation to this matter?

It may be urged that it is unfair to hold all men responsible for the lawlessness of a minority; but what is this but to confess that the majority are powerless to restrain the minority, or to say that improvement in this regard is impossible? If in the vicinity of every large town in the United States there lurked a dozen or more fierce wolves that, after nightfall, went into the town and banqueted on such of the citizens as they could secure, we may without much doubt assert that such a state of things, when once found to exist, would come to a speedy termination; for every man would feel that the common safety of all demanded the exertion of his strength in the contest with the wild beasts. But let it be understood that the honor of every woman is endangered when she goes from place to place alone at night, and we accept the fact as no reproach on our common manhood, but merely fancy that all requirements of duty are satisfied if we provide defenceless woman with a responsible male escort.

But woman's timidity is an inheritance, says some one. That is true enough; but is there no active present reason for its continued existence? Let any newspaper with its numberless accounts of brutal assaults upon women make answer to this. That the perpetrators of such crimes often meet with swift retributive justice at the hands of an enraged mob has little influence in the creation of a public opinion strong enough to make crimes of this kind eventually unknown, simply because public opinion, when it thus becomes the instrument of justice, is not worked upon by the nobler aspects of the case.

Crimes against property are always looked upon by the average man as more heinous than any others, and it is useless to deny that the average man regards his wife as his property. She is

"Something better than his dog, a little dearer than his horse,"

it is true, but his property nevertheless. The indignation which he feels on hearing of some assault upon a woman differs in degree, but scarcely in kind, from the horror with which certain frontier communities regard the crime of horse-stealing. In each case the sin is committed against property. In the frontier town every man feels that his own property is in danger while the horse-thief is still at large; and similarly the average man argues with re-

spect to his own wife while the ravisher goes unwhipt of justice. Hence his speedy resort to the swiftest punishment possible in each case.

But suppose the idea of personal ownership is not involved in any way, as it is, refine it how we may, in all instances of the kind first cited, or in all accusations of adultery brought by the husband against his wife. Suppose we consider simply one prominent attitude in which the majority of men stand towards womankind. And what is that attitude? Briefly and plainly it is that man's physical welfare requires for its maintenance the moral ruin of unnumbered thousands of women.

It is prudery to be shocked at such a putting of the matter, when we know that the practice of the average man is in fullest accord with the statement just made. Our age is easily shocked in certain directions, but our superior virtue is not incontestably proved by the fact that we are less plain-spoken than our ancestors. What should most concern us is to see whether or no such a statement be true or false.

That it is a false or misleading presentment I leave for others to maintain; that it is a true condensation of the theory held by the majority of men I do not hesitate to assert.

The tolerant attitude taken by many men of blameless lives towards sexual sins is often urged against them as a reproach by women. In this women are partly right and partly wrong. They are in the wrong because they are prone to magnify the guilt of sins of this kind so far above that of other violations of the rule of right living as thereby practically to ignore at times the existence of other sins. They thus exhibit a distorted sense of proportion in morals, and so weaken the influence they might otherwise exert upon the practice of men in this direction. But they are in the right to a certain extent in urging their reproach because the easy judgment passed upon sexual sins, even by men who have no notion of committing them, helps in its way to make the commission of those offences more readily possible.

Masculine society tacitly assumes that the overwhelming majority of men will not remain virtuous. It also assumes that a vast number of women must lead unchaste lives in order that the sexual appetites of the before-mentioned men may be gratified. Now see how differently the two sets of individuals involved in these assumptions are regarded by the world at large. The first-named are seeking the gratification of a natural instinct, we say. If the men are young and unmarried, we say "boys will be boys," and if married, we are not very much inclined to severer judgment so long as there is no outraging of conventionalities. But if young women indulge in practices of this kind, we do not good-naturedly excuse them by saying "girls will be girls," or extend to them the same leniency of judgment passed upon their brothers; what is natural in the one sex appears to be most perverse and unnatural in the other. We forgive the one class readily enough, or even deny the need of the exercise of forgiveness: the other class we refuse to respect, if we be men, or if we be women, we refuse to forgive.

To tacitly admit that incontinence is, if not commendable, at least a very venial transgression for the male sex, but something quite opposite for the female sex, carries with it the practical confession that right thinking as well as right acting in relation to so important a matter is for the present unattainable. It is to admit, moreover, that man has made but very little progress from the animal to the spiritual in this respect in all the ages that have gone before up to the present, and it seemingly involves the denial of the possibility of such advance in the future.

The church has not contributed materially to the solution of this moral question. It has held up an ideal of what man should be in this particular, but it has never strenuously denied what the practice of the average man declares; namely, that the attainment of such an ideal of virtue by man is an impossible achievement. It has *preached* chastity for man as well as for woman, but it has usually stopped with preaching.

It matters little what advancement is made in any or all departments of human knowledge, or what increase of refinement marks our progress through the centuries, if men are to remain at the end of it all as essentially brutal in the satisfaction of sexual desire as the savage in his wilderness countless æons ago. So long as the average man, refined or otherwise, persists in acting up to his belief that the physical well-being of his sex inexorably calls for the separation from the ranks of virtuous women of hundreds of thousands of their sisters, and the consequent moral ruin of these ministers to his pleasure; so long as he contentedly suffers this perpetual sacrifice to be offered up in his behalf, so long may ours be truthfully as well as sadly called the brutal sex!

OSCAR FAY ADAMS.

IN FAVOR OF THE JEW.

WE CONDEMN the anti-Semitic legislation of Russia and contrast the condition of the Jews in this free and favored country, but we continue to foster prejudice and retail worn charges which we have never taken the trouble to investigate.

"I cannot understand your associating with Jews," said an ordinarily amiable young woman. "I don't like them and don't want to have anything to do with them." "Have you any personal acquaintance with them?" I asked. "I can't say that I have. There was a Jewish girl at our boarding-school, but that was different; she was bright, and pleasant, and *quite like other people*." Many other "critics" are not more enlightened.

Some charges are obsolete, but we hear continually that Jews are sordid, mean, rapacious. They arrive in this country poor and speedily become rich, and this is the result of over-reaching and trickery. They do not assist in the development of the country by becoming mechanics or agriculturists. They are revengeful. They are rude, uncultured, ostentatious. They are intolerant and hostile to Christianity. They always have been and always will be an alien race, and America wants citizens and patriots.

Let us hear the other side.

Though a stain of meanness and cunning has been imprinted by centuries of Gentile oppression, many Jews are unspotted by it and show the purest quality of honor. Their success is mainly due to business habits, thrift, and intelligence. They have drawn capital to the country and increased its commercial influence. They are eager to acquire, but ready to give. I know Russian Jews, poor and superstitious, who allowed an aged Christian woman to occupy a room in their house, rent free, while she was too ill to work, and supplied her with necessities for weeks. The generosity of wealthy Jews is too well-known to require illustration or comment. The brother of Bishop Helmuth, founder of Helmuth College, in London, Canada, was a tolerant and generous Jew. When Isaac Helmuth entered the Christian ministry, he was disinherited by his father, who left about \$400,000 to one son. But that favored son said, "The half of this belongs to Isaac"; and to Isaac Helmuth it was sent.